



Complex Intuitionistic Fuzzy Neutrosophic Structures in Lie Algebras: Subalgebras, Ideals and Homomorphisms

Mukhtar Ahmad, Surapati Pramanik and Nazneen Khan

ABSTRACT: This work develops new concepts of *complex intuitionistic fuzzy neutrosophic Lie subalgebras and ideals* within a framework governed by neutrosophic norm functions, namely the *t-norm* (\mathcal{T}^*) and *s-norm* (\mathcal{S}). The connections between these newly defined objects and traditional Lie subalgebras and ideals are carefully analyzed. Moreover, algebraic constructions including *intersection, sum, and homomorphic images* are introduced for these structures, and a collection of essential structural properties and theoretical results is established.

Keywords: Complex neutrosophic intuitionistic fuzzy sets, neutrosophic sets, neutrosophic norm, neutrosophic Lie subalgebra, t-norm and s-norm, neutrosophic ideal, fuzzy Lie structures, homomorphisms.

Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 Preliminaries	2
3 Main Results	7
4 Conclusion	32
5 Future Work Problem	32

1. Introduction

During the 1870s, Marius Sophus Lie proposed the concept of Lie algebras, which eventually became a fundamental framework in mathematics and theoretical physics. In 1965, Lotfi A. Zadeh developed the fuzzy set theory [27] that provides a tool to depict uncertainty by permitting truth values to exist anywhere within the range $[0, 1]$, instead of following traditional binary logic. The fuzzy set [27] led to the idea of “fuzziness,” in which statements are not confined to being completely true or false. The fuzzy set theory has been utilized in various fields, such as artificial intelligence, computer science, control systems, decision-making, formal logic, and management. Expanding on these advancements, numerous studies [8], [25], [26] explored the structures of fuzzy Lie subalgebras that combine the analytical precision of Lie theory with the adaptability of fuzzy logic.

As a refinement of Zadeh’s model, Atanassov presented the intuitionistic fuzzy set [3] as a broadened version of Zadeh’s foundational fuzzy set theory [27]. In contrast to conventional fuzzy sets, the intuitionistic set [3] includes both the level of membership and the level of non-membership offering a more comprehensive structure for depicting uncertainty. Its improved descriptive capability renders it especially useful in contemporary mathematical uses.

Building on these concepts, Ramot et al. [11] introduced the idea of complex fuzzy sets by broadening membership functions into the realm of complex numbers. Subsequently, Alkouri and Salleh [2] introduced a more advanced version termed complex intuitionistic fuzzy sets, which incorporate complex-valued functions for membership and non-membership, providing an even more adaptable framework for modeling uncertainty.

The distinctiveness of the complex intuitionistic fuzzy set lies in its greater expressive capacity: the functions for membership and non-membership can now take values on the unit circle in the complex

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 03F55, 17B99, 17B05, 17A30, 08A72, 03E99.

Submitted July 26, 2025. Published April 17, 2026.

plane, in contrast to the conventional real interval $[0, 1]$. This broadened value range enhances the set's flexibility in expressing nuanced degrees of uncertainty and hesitation in complex systems.

In a related direction, the neutrosophic extension of the real number system introduces an indeterminate element I , satisfying $I^2 = I$, $I^n = I$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, while lacking a multiplicative inverse [28,29]. The neutrosophic framework has attracted considerable attention and has been successfully applied in diverse areas, including decision-making [30,31], artificial intelligence and machine learning [32,33], medical diagnosis [34,35,40], communication systems [36], pattern recognition [37], educational technologies [38], theoretical physics [39], and data science [41]. Later, representative applications include medical diagnosis, where machine learning models based on neutrosophic sets improve cancer classification [43], and decision analysis, where hybrid neutrosophic frameworks address uncertainty in seismic risk evaluation [45].

As discussed in [29], F. Smarandache introduced the notion of single-valued neutrosophic probability, formulated as a mapping

$$P_N : X \rightarrow [0, 1]^3$$

where X represents a neutrosophic sample space that accommodates indeterminate elements. The neutrosophic probability of an event A is expressed as

$$P_N(\tilde{Q}) = \left(\mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{Q}), I(\text{neut}\tilde{d}_1), F(\text{anti}\tilde{d}_1) \right) = (\mathcal{T}^*, I, F)$$

with each component $\mathcal{T}^*, I, F \in [0, 1]$ and their sum satisfying $0 \leq \mathcal{T}^* + I + F \leq 3$.

In recent studies, Abobala and Hatip [42] collaborators introduced the framework of two-dimensional AH-isometry to establish a relationship between the neutrosophic plane $\mathbb{R}(I) \times \mathbb{R}(I)$ and the conventional module $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. They also discussed a one-dimensional AH-isometry connecting $\mathbb{R}(I)$ with $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. This approach has proven instrumental in formulating inner products, organizing norms, and modeling geometric structures in a neutrosophic setting [42].

Several researchers have explored the characteristics of fuzzy algebraic structures through the application of norms [12], [13]–[24]. In this work, we propose the notions of complex intuitionistic fuzzy neutrosophic Lie subalgebras and Lie ideals, formulated using t-norm(\mathcal{T}^*) and s-norm(\mathcal{S}^*) within the framework of Lie subalgebras. We investigate their foundational properties, and further define operations such as intersection and addition for these constructs. The algebraic features of these operations are thoroughly analyzed. Additionally, we study how these structures behave under Lie subalgebra homomorphisms.

2. Preliminaries

This section introduces essential definitions related to neutrosophic logic and neutrosophic probability. We begin by recalling fundamental concepts that are crucial for the subsequent analysis. It includes basic Defns and preliminary results that will be used throughout the paper. For more detailed discussions, the reader is referred to references [1]–[10].

Definition 2.1 [44] *A Lie algebra is a vector space L over a field F (typically \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C}), equipped with a binary operation $[\cdot, \cdot] : L \times L \rightarrow L$, written as $(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}) \mapsto [\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]$, that satisfies the following conditions:*

1. *The operation $[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]$ is bilinear in both arguments,*
2. *$[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varrho}] = 0$ for every $\check{\varrho} \in L$,*
3. *The identity*

$$[[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}], z] + [[\check{\varsigma}, z], \check{\varrho}] + [[z, \check{\varrho}], \check{\varsigma}] = 0,$$

holds for all $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z \in L$. This is known as the Jacobi identity.

In this work, the symbol L will represent a Lie algebra. Note that the Lie bracket is generally not associative; that is, $[[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}], z] \neq [\check{\varrho}, [\check{\varsigma}, z]]$ in general. However, the bracket is anti-commutative: $[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}] = -[\check{\varsigma}, \check{\varrho}]$. A vector subspace $H \subseteq L$ that remains closed under the bracket operation is referred to as a Lie subalgebra. Similarly, a subspace $I \subseteq L$ for which $[I, L] \subseteq I$ holds is called a Lie ideal. Clearly, every Lie ideal is also a Lie subalgebra.

Definition 2.2 [44] Let L_1 and L_2 be Lie algebras over a field F . A linear transformation $\mathcal{U} : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ is called a Lie homomorphism if $\mathcal{U}([\check{\rho}, \check{\zeta}]) = [\mathcal{U}(\check{\rho}), \mathcal{U}(\check{\zeta})]$ for all $\check{\rho}, \check{\zeta} \in L_1$.

Definition 2.3 [44] Let $\check{\rho}, \check{\zeta}$, and Z be sets. A function $\mathcal{U} = (\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2) : X \rightarrow Y \times Z$ is referred to as a complex mapping if it consists of two component functions: $\mathcal{U}_1 : X \rightarrow Y$ and $\mathcal{U}_2 : X \rightarrow Z$.

Definition 2.4 [44] Let X be a nonempty set. A mapping

$$A = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}, \Upsilon_{\check{\rho}}) : X \rightarrow [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$$

is called an intuitionistic fuzzy set (IFS) in X if

$$\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}) + \Upsilon_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}) \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } x \in X,$$

where the mappings $\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}} : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\Upsilon_{\check{\rho}} : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denote the membership and non-membership functions of A , respectively. In particular, 0^\sim and 1^\sim denote the intuitionistic fuzzy empty set and the intuitionistic fuzzy whole set in X , defined by

$$0^\sim(\check{\rho}) = (0, 1), \quad 1^\sim(\check{\rho}) = (1, 0),$$

for all $x \in X$. We denote the family of all intuitionistic fuzzy sets in X by $\text{IFS}(\check{\rho})$.

Definition 2.5 [11] Let X be a nonempty set, and suppose $\check{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}, \Upsilon_{\check{\rho}})$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}, \Upsilon_{\check{\rho}})$ are two intuitionistic fuzzy sets (IFSs) defined on X . Then the following hold:

1. $\check{\mathcal{Q}} \subseteq \check{\mathcal{D}}$ if and only if, for every $\check{\rho} \in X$,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}) \leq \mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}), \quad \Upsilon_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}) \geq \Upsilon_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}).$$

2. $\check{\mathcal{Q}} = \check{\mathcal{D}}$ if and only if both $\check{\mathcal{Q}} \subseteq \check{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \check{\mathcal{Q}}$ hold.

Definition 2.6 [11] Let X be a nonempty set. A complex fuzzy set $\check{\mathcal{Q}}$ defined on X is a collection of ordered pairs of the form

$$\check{\mathcal{Q}} = \{(\check{\rho}, \mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho})) \mid \check{\rho} \in X\},$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}$ is a function assigning to each $\check{\rho} \in X$ a complex-valued membership degree $\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho})$ that lies within the unit disk in the complex plane.

Each membership value is assumed to be expressed in polar form:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}) = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho})e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho})},$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$, $\hat{\rho}_{\check{\rho}} : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ represents the modulus, and $\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\rho}} : X \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ denotes the phase angle.

Setting $\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}) = 0$ for all $\check{\rho} \in X$ retrieves the standard (real-valued) fuzzy set as a special case.

Further, let $\mathcal{E}_1 = r_1e^{iw_1}$, $\mathcal{E}_2 = r_2e^{iw_2}$, and $\mathcal{E}_3 = r_3e^{iw_3}$ be complex numbers within the unit circle. Then, the expression

$$\mathcal{E}_1 \leq \mathcal{E}_2 \leq \mathcal{E}_3$$

denotes the condition

$$r_1 \leq r_2 \leq r_3 \quad \text{and} \quad w_1 \leq w_2 \leq w_3.$$

Definition 2.7 [11] A complex intuitionistic fuzzy set $\check{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}, \gamma_{\check{\rho}})$, defined over a universe U , consists of two complex-valued functions: $\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho})$ representing the degree of membership and $\gamma_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho})$ representing the degree of non-membership of each element $\check{\rho} \in U$.

Both functions take values inside the unit disk in the complex plane and are represented in polar coordinates as:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}) = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho})e^{i\omega_{\mathcal{E}_{\check{\rho}}}(\check{\rho})}, \quad \gamma_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho}) = k_{\check{\rho}}(\check{\rho})e^{i\omega_{\gamma_{\check{\rho}}}(\check{\rho})},$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$, the magnitude functions $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$ and $k_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$ satisfy $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), k_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \in [0, 1]$, and their sum adheres to the condition:

$$0 \leq \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) + k_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq 1.$$

The phase functions $\omega_{\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})$ and $\omega_{\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})$ are real-valued functions mapping into the interval $[0, 2\pi]$.

This framework allows for complex-valued assessments of both membership and non-membership, while ensuring their combined intensity remains within the allowed bounds.

Definition 2.8 Let X be a nonempty set. A mapping

$$\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}) : X \rightarrow [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$$

is called a neutrosophic intuitionistic fuzzy set (NIFS) in X if for every $\check{\varrho} \in X$,

$$0 \leq \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) + \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) + \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq 3.$$

Here:

1. $\Omega_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denotes the truth (membership) degree,
2. $\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denotes the indeterminacy degree,
3. $\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}} : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denotes the falsity (non-membership) degree.

In particular, the neutrosophic intuitionistic fuzzy empty and whole sets, denoted by 0^{\sim} and 1^{\sim} , are defined by

$$0^{\sim}(\check{\varrho}) = (0, 1, 1), \quad 1^{\sim}(\check{\varrho}) = (1, 0, 0) \quad \text{for all } \check{\varrho} \in X.$$

The family of all neutrosophic intuitionistic fuzzy sets on X is denoted by $\text{NIFS}(X)$.

Definition 2.9 Let X be a nonempty set, and suppose $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}})$ and $\tilde{D} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{D}})$ are two NIFSs defined on X . Then the following hold:

1. $\tilde{Q} \subseteq \tilde{D}$ if and only if, for every $\check{\varrho} \in X$,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}), \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}), \quad \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}).$$

2. $\tilde{Q} = \tilde{D}$ if and only if both $\tilde{Q} \subseteq \tilde{D}$ and $\tilde{D} \subseteq \tilde{Q}$ hold.

Definition 2.10 Let X be a nonempty set, and suppose $\tilde{Q} = (\Omega_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \Theta_{\tilde{Q}})$ and $\tilde{D} = (\Omega_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \Theta_{\tilde{D}})$ are NIFSs defined on X . Then the following hold:

1. $\tilde{Q} \subseteq \tilde{D}$ if and only if, for every $\check{\varrho} \in X$,

$$\Omega_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq \Omega_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}), \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}), \quad \Theta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq \Theta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}).$$

2. $\tilde{Q} = \tilde{D}$ if and only if both $\tilde{Q} \subseteq \tilde{D}$ and $\tilde{D} \subseteq \tilde{Q}$ hold.

Definition 2.11 A complex neutrosophic intuitionistic fuzzy set (CNIFS) $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}})$ over a universe U is determined by three complex-valued functions: $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$ (membership) and $\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$ (non-membership), and $\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$ (indeterminacy) defined for each $\check{\varrho} \in U$. Both functions take values inside the unit disc of the complex plane.

The membership, non-membership and indeterminacy degrees are represented in polar form:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) e^{i\omega_{\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = k_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) e^{i\omega_{\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = \hat{q}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) e^{i\omega_{\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})}$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$, the magnitudes $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$, $k_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$ and $\hat{q}_{\tilde{Q}}$ belong to $[0, 1]$, and the phase angles $\omega_{\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})$, $\omega_{\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})$, $\omega_{\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})$ lie in $[0, 2\pi]$, and

$$0 \leq \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) + k_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) + \omega_{\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq 3$$

subject to the constraint

$$\omega_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) = 3 - \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) - k_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}).$$

This formulation extends the standard neutrosophic intuitionistic fuzzy set NIFS structure into the complex domain, allowing complex-valued degrees of truth, indeterminacy, and falsity.

Definition 2.12 A tri-nary t-norm \mathcal{T}^* is a function

$$\mathcal{T}^* : [0, 1]^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

satisfying the following properties for all $\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z, w \in [0, 1]$:

- (T1) $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, 1) = \mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, 1, \tilde{\varsigma}) = \mathcal{T}^*(1, \check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}) = \mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma})$ (neutral element),
- (T2) $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z) \leq \mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, w)$ if $z \leq w$ (monotonicity in each argument),
- (T3) $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z)$ is symmetric in its arguments (commutativity),
- (T4) $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, \mathcal{T}^*(z, w, u)) = \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z), w, u)$ (associativity in a generalized form),

That is, a tri-nary t-norm extends the binary t-norm to operate on three inputs while preserving the essential properties of neutrality, monotonicity, commutativity, and associativity.

Moreover, it follows that if $\check{\varrho}_1 \geq \check{\varrho}_2$, $\tilde{\varsigma}_1 \geq \tilde{\varsigma}_2$, and $z_1 \geq z_2$, then:

$$\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}_1, \tilde{\varsigma}_1, z_1) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}_2, \tilde{\varsigma}_2, z_2).$$

Example 2.1

1. Tri-nary minimum \mathcal{T}^* -norm:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\min}^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z) = \min\{\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z\}.$$

This is a natural extension of the standard intersection t-norm to three variables.

2. Tri-nary algebraic product \mathcal{T}^* -norm:

$$\mathcal{T}_p^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z) = \check{\varrho} \cdot \tilde{\varsigma} \cdot z.$$

This generalizes the binary algebraic product t-norm and preserves associativity and commutativity.

3. Tri-nary bounded sum \mathcal{T}^* -norm:

$$\mathcal{T}_D^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z) = \max\{0, \check{\varrho} + \tilde{\varsigma} + z - 2\}.$$

This is the 3-variable extension of the bounded sum, ensuring the output remains in $[0, 1]$.

4. Tri-nary drastic \mathcal{T}^* -norm:

$$\mathcal{T}_D^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z) = \begin{cases} \min\{\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z\}, & \text{if at least two of } \check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z \text{ are equal to 1,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This extends the drastic t-norm to three variables with a more selective condition for nonzero output.

5. Tri-nary Hamacher product:

$$\mathcal{T}_h^*(\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}, z) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \check{\varrho} = \tilde{\varsigma} = z = 0, \\ \frac{\check{\varrho}\tilde{\varsigma}z}{\check{\varrho}\tilde{\varsigma} + \tilde{\varsigma}z + z\check{\varrho} - 2\check{\varrho}\tilde{\varsigma}z}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This is an extension of the Hamacher product to tri-nary input while preserving the form of the denominator to maintain proper normalization.

Example 2.2 The tri-nary drastic t -norm represents the minimal tri-nary t -norm in a pointwise sense, whereas the tri-nary minimum t -norm serves as the maximal one. That is, for all $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z \in [0, 1]$, the following holds:

$$\mathcal{T}_D^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) \leq \mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) \leq \mathcal{T}_{\min}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z),$$

where

$$\mathcal{T}_D^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) = \begin{cases} \min\{\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z\}, & \text{if at least two of } \check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z \text{ equal } 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_{\min}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) = \min\{\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z\}.$$

Note that a tri-nary t -norm \mathcal{T}^* is said to be *idempotent* if it satisfies the condition $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varrho}, \check{\varrho}) = \check{\varrho}$ for every $\check{\varrho} \in [0, 1]$.

Lemma 2.1 Let $\mathcal{T}^* : [0, 1]^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a tri-nary t -norm. Then, for all $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, w, z \in [0, 1]$, the following equality holds:

$$\mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, 1), \mathcal{T}^*(w, z, 1), 1) = \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, w, 1), \mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varsigma}, z, 1), 1).$$

Lemma 2.2 Let $\mathcal{T}^* : [0, 1]^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a tri-nary t -norm. Thus, for all $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z \in [0, 1]$, the following properties hold:

1. $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) \leq \min\{\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z\}$.
2. $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) = 0$ if and only if at least one of $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z$ is zero.
3. $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, 1) = \mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma})$ where $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma})$ is the induced binary t -norm by fixing the third argument as 1.
4. $\mathcal{T}^*(\check{\varrho}, 1, 1) = \check{\varrho}$ (neutral element property).

Definition 2.13 A tri-nary \acute{S} -norm is a function

$$\acute{S} : [0, 1]^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

that meets the following criteria for any $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z, w \in [0, 1]$:

(S1) $\acute{S}(\check{\varrho}, 0, 0) = \check{\varrho}$ (identity element),

(S2) If $\check{\varsigma} \leq w$ and $z \leq w$, then

$$\acute{S}(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) \leq \acute{S}(\check{\varrho}, w, w)$$

which expresses monotonicity,

(S3) \acute{S} is symmetric with respect to its arguments; that is,

$$\acute{S}(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) = \acute{S}(\pi(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z))$$

for any permutation π of the set $\{\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z\}$,

(S4) \acute{S} satisfies associativity in the following form

$$\acute{S}(\check{\varrho}, \acute{S}(\check{\varsigma}, z, w), 0) = \acute{S}(\acute{S}(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, 0), z, w).$$

Furthermore, the function \acute{S} is called idempotent if for every $\check{\varrho} \in [0, 1]$,

$$\acute{S}(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varrho}, \check{\varrho}) = \check{\varrho}.$$

Example 2.3 Some fundamental tri-nary \acute{S} -norms are defined as follows for any $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z \in [0, 1]$:

$$\acute{S}_m(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) = \max\{\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z\},$$

$$\acute{S}_D(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) = \min\{1, \check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma} + z\},$$

$$\acute{S}_p(\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}, z) = \check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma} + z - \check{\varrho}\check{\varsigma} - \check{\varrho}z - \check{\varrho}\check{\varsigma}z.$$

Here, \acute{S}_m is referred to as the standard union, \acute{S}_D as the bounded sum, and \acute{S}_p as the algebraic sum in the context of tri-nary operations.

3. Main Results

Characterization of Complex Intuitionistic Fuzzy Lie Subalgebras via Neutrosophic Norms

Definition 3.1 Let L be a Lie subalgebra. Suppose that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\tilde{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}$$

are three complex-valued functions on L , representing the membership, non-membership, and indeterminacy degrees, respectively, of a complex fuzzy set on L .

Then the triplet $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L)$ is referred to as a complex intuitionistic fuzzy neutrosophic Lie subalgebra of L , and is denoted by $\text{CIFNLS}(L)$, with respect to a chosen t -norm \mathcal{T}^* and \dot{S} -norm \dot{S} , if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
2. $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) \geq \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta})$,
3. $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
4. $\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}) \geq \min\{\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
5. $\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) \geq \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta})$,
6. $\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq \min\{\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
7. $\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \dot{S}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
8. $\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) \leq \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta})$,
9. $\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \dot{S}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
10. $\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \max\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
11. $\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) \leq \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta})$,
12. $\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \max\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
13. $\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \dot{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
14. $\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) \leq \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta})$,
15. $\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \dot{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
16. $\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \max\{\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
17. $\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) \leq \check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta})$,
18. $\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \max\{\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$.

for all $\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma} \in L$ and $\check{\tau} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Definition 3.2 Let L be a Lie subalgebra. Suppose that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\tilde{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}$$

are three complex-valued functions on L , representing membership, non-membership, and indeterminacy degrees, respectively, of complex fuzzy sets on L .

Then the triplet $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L)$ is known as a complex neutrosophic intuitionistic fuzzy Lie ideal of L under the operations defined by the t -norm \mathcal{T}^* and \dot{S} -norm \dot{S} , if the following conditions hold:

1. $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
2. $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \geq \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$,
3. $\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
4. $\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \geq \min\{\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
5. $\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \geq \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$,
6. $\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq \min\{\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
7. $\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
8. $\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$,
9. $\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
10. $\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \max\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
11. $\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$,
12. $\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \max\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \theta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
13. $\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
14. $\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$,
15. $\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$,
16. $\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \max\{\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$,
17. $\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$,
18. $\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \max\{\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\}$.

for every $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma} \in L$ and $\check{\tau} \in \mathcal{F}$. We denote by $\text{CNIFIS}(L)$ the collection of all complex intuitionistic fuzzy neutrosophic Lie ideals of L , considered under the norms given by a t -norm \mathcal{T} and an $\dot{\mathcal{S}}$ -norm $\dot{\mathcal{S}}$.

Example 3.1 Let $L = \mathbb{R}^3$ be a Lie algebra over \mathbb{R} , with Lie bracket defined by the cross product:

$$[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}] = \check{\varrho} \times \check{\varsigma}, \quad \text{for all } \check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma} \in L.$$

Define a complex Neutrosophic set $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L)$ on L , where:

$$\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1, \check{\varrho}_2, \check{\varrho}_3) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1 = \check{\varrho}_2 = \check{\varrho}_3 = 0, \\ 0.7, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1 = \check{\varrho}_2 = 0, \check{\varrho}_3 \neq 0, \\ 0.3, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1, \check{\varrho}_2, \check{\varrho}_3) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1 = \check{\varrho}_2 = \check{\varrho}_3 = 0, \\ \frac{\pi}{6}, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_3 \neq 0, \\ \frac{\pi}{4}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1, \check{\varrho}_2, \check{\varrho}_3) &= \begin{cases} 0.2, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1 = \check{\varrho}_2 = \check{\varrho}_3 = 0, \\ 0.4, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1^2 + \check{\varrho}_2^2 + \check{\varrho}_3^2 \leq 4, \\ 0.6, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1, \check{\varrho}_2, \check{\varrho}_3) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1 = \check{\varrho}_2 = \check{\varrho}_3 = 0, \\ \frac{\pi}{2}, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_2 \neq 0, \\ \pi, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1, \check{\varrho}_2, \check{\varrho}_3) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1 = \check{\varrho}_2 = \check{\varrho}_3 = 0, \\ 0.1, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1 = 0, \check{\varrho}_2^2 + \check{\varrho}_3^2 > 0, \\ 0.25, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1, \check{\varrho}_2, \check{\varrho}_3) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \check{\varrho}_1 = \check{\varrho}_2 = \check{\varrho}_3 = 0, \\ \frac{3\pi}{4}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Let the t -norm and s -norm be defined by

$$\mathcal{T}^*(\check{d}_1, \check{d}_2) = \check{d}_1\check{d}_2, \quad \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\check{d}_1, \check{d}_2) = \check{d}_1 + \check{d}_2 - \check{d}_1\check{d}_2.$$

Then $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in IFS(L)$ satisfies all the required conditions for a complex neutrosophic intuitionistic fuzzy Lie subalgebra, i.e., $A \in CIFNLS(L)$.

Lemma 3.1 Let $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in CIFNLS(L)$, and suppose \mathcal{T}^* and $\dot{\mathcal{S}}$ are idempotent t - and $\dot{\mathcal{S}}$ -norms, respectively. Then the following properties hold:

1. $\tilde{Q}(0) \supseteq \tilde{Q}(\check{\varrho})$ for every $\check{\varrho} \in L$.
2. $\tilde{Q}(\check{\varrho}) = \tilde{Q}(-\check{\varrho})$ for all $\check{\varrho} \in L$.
3. $\tilde{Q}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) = \tilde{Q}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\varrho}])$ for all $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma} \in L$.
4. $\tilde{Q}(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}) = \tilde{Q}(0)$ implies that $\tilde{Q}(\check{\varrho}) = \tilde{Q}(\check{\varsigma})$ for all $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma} \in L$.

Proof: (1) Let $\check{\varrho} \in L$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(0) &= \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + (-\check{\varrho})) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(-\check{\varrho})) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})) = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \\ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(0) &= \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + (-\check{\varrho})) \geq \text{Min} \{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(-\check{\varrho}) \} \geq \text{Min} \{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \} = \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \\ \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(0) &= \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + (-\check{\varrho})) \leq \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(-\check{\varrho})) \leq \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})) = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \\ \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(0) &= \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + (-\check{\varrho})) \leq \text{Max} \{ \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(-\check{\varrho}) \} \leq \text{Max} \{ \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \} = \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \\ \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(0) &= \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + (-\check{\varrho})) \leq \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(-\check{\varrho})) \leq \dot{\mathcal{S}}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})) = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \\ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(0) &= \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + (-\check{\varrho})) \leq \text{Max} \{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(-\check{\varrho}) \} \leq \text{Max} \{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \} = \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}).\end{aligned}$$

As a result

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(0) = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(0)e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(0)} \geq \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})} = \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$$

and

$$\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(0) = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(0)e^{i\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(0)} \leq \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})e^{i\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})} = \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$$

and

$$\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0) = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0)e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0)} \leq \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})} = \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})$$

and so

$$\check{\mathcal{Q}}(0) = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0), \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0)) \supseteq (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0)) = \check{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}).$$

(2) Let $\check{\vartheta} \in L$. As

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) &= \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}((-1)\check{\vartheta}) \geq \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(-\check{\vartheta})) \geq \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) \\ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) &= \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}((-1)\check{\vartheta}) \geq \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(-\check{\vartheta})) \geq \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) \\ \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) &= \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}((-1)\check{\vartheta}) \leq \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(-\check{\vartheta})) \leq \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) &= \tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}((-1)\check{\vartheta}) \leq \tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(-\check{\vartheta})) \leq \tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) \\ \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) &= \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}((-1)\check{\vartheta}) \leq \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(-\check{\vartheta})) \leq \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) \\ \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}) &= \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}((-1)\check{\vartheta}) \leq \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(-\check{\vartheta})) \leq \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}). \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly

$$\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})} = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})} = \mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})$$

and

$$\Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})e^{i\tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})} = \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})e^{i\tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})} = \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})$$

and

$$\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})} = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})} = \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})$$

therefore

$$\check{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta})) = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}), \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta}), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-\check{\vartheta})) = \check{\mathcal{Q}}(-\check{\vartheta}).$$

(3) Let $\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma} \in L$. Then by using part(2) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) &= \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-[\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) \\ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) &= \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-[\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) = \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) \\ \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) &= \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-[\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) = \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) \\ \tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) &= \tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-[\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) = \tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) \\ \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) &= \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-[\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) \\ \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) &= \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-[\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) = \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]) \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}])e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}])} = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])} = \mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])$$

and

$$\Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) = \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}])e^{i\tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}])} = \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])e^{i\tilde{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])} = \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])$$

and

$$\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}])e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}])} = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])} = \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])$$

so

$$\check{\mathcal{Q}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]), \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}])) = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]), \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}])) = \check{\mathcal{Q}}([\check{\varsigma}, \check{\vartheta}]).$$

(4) Let $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma} \in L$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}) &= \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - (\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} + (-(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}))) \\
 &\geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}))) \\
 &= \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0)) \\
 &\geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})) \\
 &= \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \\
 &= \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma} + \check{\varsigma}) \\
 &\geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})) \\
 &\geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})
 \end{aligned}$$

thus $\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})$. As

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}) &= \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - (\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} + (-(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}))) \\
 &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma})) \right\} \\
 &= \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}) \right\} \\
 &= \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0) \right\} \\
 &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \right\} \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma} + \check{\varsigma}) \\
 &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}), \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\} \\
 &= \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0), \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\} \\
 &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}), \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\} \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}).
 \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we obtain $\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) = \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})$. Consequently, it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})} = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})} = \mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}).$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}) &= \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - (\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} + (-(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}))) \\
 &\leq \mathcal{S}'(\tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma}))) \\
 &= \mathcal{S}'(\tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \check{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \mathcal{S}'(\tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(0))
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta})) \\
&= \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \\
&= \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma} + \check{\varsigma}) \\
&\leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma}), \hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \\
&= \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(0), \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \\
&\leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}), \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \\
&= \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\tilde{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})$. Also

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) &= \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - (\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma})) \\
&= \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} + (-(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma}))) \\
&\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(-(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma})) \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma}) \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(0) \right\} \\
&\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \right\} \\
&= \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \\
&= \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma} + \check{\varsigma}) \\
&\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma}), \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(0), \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\} \\
&\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}), \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\} \\
&= \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})
\end{aligned}$$

this implies that $\zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})$. As a consequence, we have

$$\Upsilon_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) = \tilde{\rho}(\check{\vartheta})e^{i\zeta(\check{\vartheta})} = \tilde{\rho}(\check{\varsigma})e^{i\zeta(\check{\varsigma})} = \Upsilon_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}).$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) &= \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - (\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma})) \\
&= \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} + (-(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma}))) \\
&\leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(-(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma}))) \\
&= \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma})) \\
&= \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(0)) \\
&\leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta})) \\
&= \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \\
&= \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\check{\vartheta} - \check{\varsigma} + \check{\varsigma})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \tilde{\varsigma}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(0), \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})) \\
 &\leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma}), \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude that $\hat{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) = \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma}) &= \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - (\check{\varrho} - \tilde{\varsigma})) \\
 &= \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} + (-(\check{\varrho} - \tilde{\varsigma}))) \\
 &\leq \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(-(\check{\varrho} - \tilde{\varsigma}))\} \\
 &= \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \tilde{\varsigma})\} \\
 &= \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(0)\} \\
 &\leq \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})\} \\
 &= \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \\
 &= \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \tilde{\varsigma} + \tilde{\varsigma}) \\
 &\leq \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} - \tilde{\varsigma}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})\} \\
 &= \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(0), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})\} \\
 &\leq \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})\} \\
 &= \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) = \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})$. Consequently, we have

$$\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) = \hat{\xi}(\check{\varrho})e^{i\dot{\chi}(\check{\varrho})} = \hat{\xi}(\tilde{\varsigma})e^{i\dot{\chi}(\tilde{\varsigma})} = \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma}).$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho})) = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma}), \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma}), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})) = \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\tilde{\varsigma}).$$

□

Proposition 3.1 *Let L be a Lie subalgebra and consider $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L)$, where*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}e^{i\tilde{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}}, \quad \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}} = \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}},$$

are three complex fuzzy functions defined on L . Suppose \mathcal{T}^ and \mathcal{S} are idempotent norms. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})$ belongs to $\text{CIFNLS}(L)$.

2. For any $t, s, l \in [0, 1]$, the set

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t &= \{\check{\varrho} \in L \mid \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \succeq (t, s, l)\} = \{\check{\varrho} \in L \mid \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq t, \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq s, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq l\} \\
 &= \left\{ \check{\varrho} \in L \mid \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq t, \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq t, \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq t, \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq s, \tilde{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq s, \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq s \right\}
 \end{aligned}$$

forms a subalgebra of L .

Proof: Let $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$, and let $\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$ with $\tilde{\tau} \in F$. We will demonstrate that the elements $\check{\varrho} + \tilde{\varsigma}$, $\tilde{\tau}\check{\varrho}$, and $[\check{\varrho}, \tilde{\varsigma}]$ also belong to $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$. Namely, as

$$\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho} + \tilde{\varsigma}) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\varsigma})) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(t, t) = t,$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \geq \text{Min}\{w(\check{\varrho}), w(\check{\varsigma})\} \geq \text{Min}\{t, t\} = t$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \leq \mathcal{S}(s, s) = s$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \text{Max}\{\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\} \leq \text{Max}\{s, s\} = s$$

and

$$\dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \mathcal{S}(\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \leq \mathcal{S}(s, s) = s$$

and

$$\dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\} \leq \text{Max}\{s, s\} = s.$$

Hence, it follows that $\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$. Furthermore, considering the inequalities

$$\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \geq \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq t, \quad \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \geq \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \geq t$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq s, \quad \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq s$$

and

$$\dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq \dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq s, \quad \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) \leq s.$$

We conclude that $\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}$ also belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$. Additionally,

$$\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(t, t) = t$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq \text{Min}\{\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\} \geq \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}\{t, t\} = t$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \leq \mathcal{S}(s, s) = s$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \text{Max}\{\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\} \leq \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}\{s, s\} = s$$

and

$$\dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \mathcal{S}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \leq \mathcal{S}(s, s) = s$$

and

$$\dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \text{Max}\{\dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})\} \leq \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}\{s, s\} = s$$

implying that $[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}] \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$. Consequently, $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$ forms a subalgebra of L for every $t, s, l \in [0, 1]$.

Conversely, suppose that for all $s, t, l \in [0, 1]$, the set $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$ is a Lie subalgebra of L . For arbitrary elements $\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma} \in L$ and scalar $\check{\tau} \in F$, assume

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) = (\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}), \Upsilon_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma})) \supseteq \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = (\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \Upsilon_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho})) = (t, s, l).$$

This means that

$$\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \geq \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = t, \quad \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \geq \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = t,$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \leq \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = s, \quad \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \leq \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = s,$$

$$\dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \leq \dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = l, \quad \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \leq \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}) = l.$$

Hence, both $\check{\varrho}$ and $\check{\varsigma}$ belong to $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$, which implies that their sum $\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}$, scalar multiple $\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}$, and bracket $[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]$ also lie in $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{s,l}^t$. Since

$$\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \geq t = \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \geq t = \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\}$$

and

$$\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \geq t = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \geq t = \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$$

and

$$\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq t = \mathcal{T}^* (\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq t = \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\}$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq s = \mathcal{S} (\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq s = \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\}$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq s = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq s = \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq s = \mathcal{S} (\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq s = \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\}.$$

and

$$\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq s = \mathcal{S} (\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$$

and

$$\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq s = \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\}$$

and

$$\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq s = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$$

and

$$\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) \leq s = \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho})$$

and

$$\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq s = \mathcal{S} (\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}))$$

and

$$\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq s = \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varsigma}) \right\}.$$

Therefore $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{CNIFLS}(L)$.

□

Corollary 3.1 *Let L be a Lie subalgebra and consider $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L)$, where*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}e^{i\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}$$

are complex fuzzy mappings defined on L . Assume the norms \mathcal{T}^ and \mathcal{S} are idempotent. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}})$ belongs to the class CIFNLS(L).
2. For each triple $(t, s, l) \in [0, 1]^3$, the set

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{s,l}^t &= \{\check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \tilde{Q}(\check{\vartheta}) \succeq (t, s, l)\} = \{\check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) > t, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < s, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < l\} \\ &= \left\{ \check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) > t, \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) > t, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) > t, \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < s, \check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < s, \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < s \right\} \end{aligned}$$

forms a Lie subalgebra of L .

The argument closely follows the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 3.2 *Let L be a Lie subalgebra, and consider $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L)$ where*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}$$

are complex fuzzy sets defined over L . Suppose \mathcal{T}^* and \mathcal{S} are idempotent norms. Then, the following are equivalent:

1. The triple $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}})$ is an element of CIFNLS(L).
2. For any $t, s, l \in [0, 1]$, the subset

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{s,l}^t &= \{\check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \tilde{Q}(\check{\vartheta}) \succeq (t, s, l)\} = \{\check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \geq t, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \leq s, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \leq l\} \\ &= \left\{ \check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \geq t, \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \geq t, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \geq t, \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \leq s, \check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \leq s, \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) \leq s \right\} \end{aligned}$$

forms an ideal of the Lie algebra L .

Corollary 3.2 *Let L be a Lie subalgebra, and suppose*

$$\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L),$$

where the complex fuzzy sets on L are given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}.$$

Assuming \mathcal{T}^* and \mathcal{S} are idempotent norms, the following conditions are equivalent:

1. The element $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}})$ belongs to the set CIFNLS(L).
2. For all $t, s, l \in [0, 1]$, the subset

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{s,l}^t &= \{\check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \tilde{Q}(\check{\vartheta}) \succ (t, s, l)\} = \{\check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) > t, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < s, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < l\} \\ &= \left\{ \check{\vartheta} \in L \mid \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) > t, \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) > t, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) > t, \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < s, \check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < s, \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\vartheta}) < s \right\} \end{aligned}$$

is an ideal of the Lie algebra L .

Definition 3.3 *Let L be a Lie subalgebra, and consider*

$$A = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}), \quad B = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{D}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L),$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\check{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}, \quad \check{G}_{\tilde{D}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}}$$

are complex fuzzy sets defined on L . The intersection $A \cap B$ is then defined by assigning, for every $\check{\vartheta} \in L$,

$$(A \cap B)(\check{\vartheta}) = (\mathcal{E}_{A \cap B}(\check{\vartheta}), \Upsilon_{A \cap B}(\check{\vartheta}), \check{\mathcal{G}}_{A \cap B}(\check{\vartheta})),$$

where the components are specified accordingly.

$$\begin{aligned} (A \cap B)(\check{\vartheta}) &= ((\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}) \cap (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}, \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}))(\check{\vartheta}) = (\mathcal{E}_{A \cap B}(\check{\vartheta}), \Upsilon_{A \cap B}(\check{\vartheta}), I_{A \cap B}(\check{\vartheta})) \\ &= \left((\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) e^{i(\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta})}, (\tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) e^{i(\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta})}, (\dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) e^{i(\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

such that $\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} : L \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} : L \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ and $\dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} : L \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} : L \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\dot{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \dot{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} : L \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ and $\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} : L \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$. Define

$$(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) = \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta}))$$

and

$$(\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) = \text{Min} \{ \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta}) \}$$

and

$$(\tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) = \dot{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta}))$$

and

$$(\dot{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \dot{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) = \text{Max} \{ \dot{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta}) \}$$

and

$$(\dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) = \dot{S}(\dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta}))$$

and

$$(\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) = \text{Max} \{ \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta}) \}$$

for all $\check{\vartheta} \in G$.

Proposition 3.3 Let $\check{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}) \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}, \Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}) \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}}$ and $\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} = \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}}$ and $\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} = \dot{\xi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}}$ be complex fuzzy sets on L . Then $\check{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \check{\mathcal{D}} \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$.

Proof: Let $\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma} \in L$ and $\check{\tau} \in F$. Then

(1)

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}) &= \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma})) \\ &\geq \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})), \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\varsigma}))) \\ &= \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta})), \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\varsigma}))) \\ &= \mathcal{T}^*((\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}), (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\varsigma})). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta} + \check{\varsigma}) &\geq \mathcal{T}^*((\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}), (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\varsigma})). \\ (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) &= \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta})) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta})) = (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) &= \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}])) \\ &\geq \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma})), \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\varsigma}))) \\ &= \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\vartheta}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\vartheta})), \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}}(\check{\varsigma}), \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}}(\check{\varsigma}))) \\ &= \mathcal{T}^*((\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}), (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\varsigma})). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

So,

$$(\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})([\check{\vartheta}, \check{\varsigma}]) \geq \mathcal{T}^*((\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\vartheta}), (\hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{Q}}} \cap \hat{\rho}_{\check{\mathcal{D}}})(\check{\varsigma}))$$

(4)

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta + \varsigma) &= \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta + \varsigma), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta + \varsigma) \right\} \\
&\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\varsigma) \right\}, \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\
&= \text{Min} \left\{ \text{Min} \left\{ r_1(\vartheta), r_2(\vartheta) \right\}, \text{Min} \left\{ r_1(\varsigma), r_2(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\
&= \text{Min} \left\{ \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\vartheta), \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\varsigma) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta + \varsigma) &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\vartheta), \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\varsigma) \right\}. \\
(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}})(\tau\vartheta) &= \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\tau\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tau\vartheta) \right\} \geq \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta) \right\} = \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\vartheta). \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}})([\vartheta, \varsigma]) &= \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]) \right\} \\
&\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma) \right\}, \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\
&= \text{Min} \left\{ \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta) \right\}, \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\varsigma), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\
&= \text{Min} \left\{ \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\vartheta), \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\varsigma) \right\}. \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly,

$$\left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)([\vartheta, \varsigma]) \geq \text{Min} \left\{ \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\vartheta), \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\varsigma) \right\} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta + \varsigma) &= \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta + \varsigma), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta + \varsigma)) \\
&\leq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\varsigma)), \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma))) \\
&= \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta)), \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\varsigma), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma))) \\
&= \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta), (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\varsigma).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta + \varsigma) &\leq \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta), (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\varsigma). \\
(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\tau\vartheta) &= \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\tau\vartheta), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tau\vartheta)) \leq \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta)) = (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta). \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

(7)

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})([\vartheta, \varsigma]) &= \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}([\vartheta, \varsigma])) \\
&\leq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\varsigma)), \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma))) \\
&= \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta)), \mathcal{S}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\varsigma), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma))) \\
&= \mathcal{S}((\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta), (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\varsigma))
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})([\vartheta, \varsigma]) &\leq \mathcal{S}((\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta), (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}})(\varsigma)). \tag{8} \\
(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}})(\vartheta + \varsigma) &= \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta + \varsigma), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta + \varsigma) \right\} \\
&\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\varsigma) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\vartheta), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\vartheta) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\varsigma), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\vartheta), \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{Q}} \cap \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right)(\varsigma) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta + \varsigma) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right\}. \quad (9)$$

$$\left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta) = \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta), \zeta_{\bar{D}}(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta) \right\} \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \zeta_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta) \right\} = \left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta). \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)([\vartheta, \varsigma]) &= \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]), \zeta_{\bar{D}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]) \right\} \\ &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta), \zeta_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \zeta_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma), \zeta_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)([\vartheta, \varsigma]) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\zeta_{\bar{Q}} \cap \zeta_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right\}.$$

(11)

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta + \varsigma) &= \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta + \varsigma), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta + \varsigma) \right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{S} \left(\mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma) \right), \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S} \left(\mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta) \right), \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}} \right)(\vartheta), \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}} \right)(\varsigma). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta + \varsigma) \leq \mathcal{S} \left(\left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right).$$

$$\left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta) = \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta) \right) \leq \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta) \right) = \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta). \quad (12)$$

(13)

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)([\vartheta, \varsigma]) &= \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]) \right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{S} \left(\mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma) \right), \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S} \left(\mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta) \right), \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma), \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S} \left(\left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right). \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)([\vartheta, \varsigma]) \leq \mathcal{S} \left(\left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\dot{\xi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\xi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right). \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta + \varsigma) &= \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta + \varsigma), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta + \varsigma) \right\} \\ &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta + \varsigma) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right\}. \quad (15)$$

$$\left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta) = \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\tilde{\tau}\vartheta) \right\} \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta) \right\} = \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta). \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)([\vartheta, \varsigma]) &= \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}([\vartheta, \varsigma]) \right\} \\ &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\vartheta), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\vartheta) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}}(\varsigma), \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}(\varsigma) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\vartheta), \left(\dot{\chi}_{\bar{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\bar{D}}\right)(\varsigma) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As a results,

$$(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}})([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \text{Max} \{(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}), (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} \cap \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varsigma})\}.$$

(1)–(16) show that $A \cap B \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$. Using a method akin to the proof of Proposition 3.3, we obtain the following result. \square

Proposition 3.4 *Let $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{CIFNI}(L)$ and $\tilde{D} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{D}}) \in \text{CIFNI}(L)$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}$, $\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\tilde{D}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}$, $\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{D}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}}$ be complex fuzzy sets on L . Then $\tilde{Q} \cap \tilde{D} \in \text{CIFNI}(L)$.*

Definition 3.4 *Let L be a Lie subalgebra, and consider two elements $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}})$ and $\tilde{D} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{D}})$ from $\text{NIFS}(L)$, where*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}, \quad \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}, \quad \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}, \quad \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{D}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}}$$

are complex fuzzy sets on L . We define the sum $\tilde{Q} + \tilde{D}$ for each $\check{\varrho} \in L$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{Q} + \tilde{D})(\check{\varrho}) &= ((\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}}) + (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{D}}))(\check{\varrho}) = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}+\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}), \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}+\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}), I_{\tilde{Q}+\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho})) \\ &= \left((\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} + \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) e^{i(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}} + \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho})}, (\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} + \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) e^{i(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}} + \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho})}, (\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) e^{i(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the functions

$$\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} + \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} : L \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}} + \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}} : L \rightarrow [0, 2\pi], \quad \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} : L \rightarrow [0, 1],$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} + \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} : L \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}} + \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}} : L \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$$

are defined accordingly. $\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}} : L \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$. Define

$$(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} + \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) = \sup_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\varrho}_1 + \check{\varrho}_2} \mathcal{T}^* \left(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}_2) \right)$$

and

$$(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}} + \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) = \text{Min}_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\varrho}_1 + \check{\varrho}_2} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}_2) \right\}$$

and

$$(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} + \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) = \inf_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\varrho}_1 + \check{\varrho}_2} \mathcal{S} \left(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1), \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}_2) \right)$$

and

$$(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) = \text{Max}_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\varrho}_1 + \check{\varrho}_2} \left\{ \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1), \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}_2) \right\}$$

and

$$(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) = \inf_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\varrho}_1 + \check{\varrho}_2} \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}_2) \right)$$

and

$$(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}})(\check{\varrho}) = \text{Max}_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\varrho}_1 + \check{\varrho}_2} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\varrho}_1), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\varrho}_2) \right\}$$

for all $\check{\varrho} \in L$.

Proposition 3.5 *Let $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$ and $\tilde{D} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{D}}) \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}$, $\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{Q}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\tilde{D}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}$, $\check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{D}} = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}}$ be complex fuzzy sets on L . Then $\tilde{Q} + \tilde{D} \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$.*

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta} + \tilde{\varsigma}) &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta}), (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\tilde{\varsigma}) \right\}. \\
 (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) &= \text{Max}_{\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}=\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_1+\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_2} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_1), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_2) \right\} \\
 &\leq \text{Max}_{\check{\vartheta}=\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_2} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_2) \right\} \\
 &= (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta})
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) ([\check{\vartheta}, \tilde{\varsigma}]) &= \text{Max}_{[\check{\vartheta}, \tilde{\varsigma}]=[\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2]+[\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2]), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}([\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]) \right\} \\
 &\leq \text{Max}_{[\check{\vartheta}, \tilde{\varsigma}]=[\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2]+[\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_2) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\
 &= \text{Max}_{[\check{\vartheta}, \tilde{\varsigma}]=[\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_2+\check{\delta}_4]} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\
 &= \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max}_{\check{\vartheta}=\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_3} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right\}, \text{Max}_{\tilde{\varsigma}=\check{\delta}_2+\check{\delta}_4} \left\{ \zeta_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \zeta_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\
 &= \text{Max} \left\{ (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta}), (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\tilde{\varsigma}) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta} + \tilde{\varsigma}) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta}), (\zeta_{\tilde{Q}} + \zeta_{\tilde{D}}) (\tilde{\varsigma}) \right\}.
 \tag{12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta} + \tilde{\varsigma}) &= \inf_{\check{\vartheta}+\tilde{\varsigma}=\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_2+\check{\delta}_3+\check{\delta}_4} \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_2), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3 + \check{\delta}_4) \right) \\
 &\leq \inf_{\check{\vartheta}+\tilde{\varsigma}=\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_2+\check{\delta}_3+\check{\delta}_4} \mathcal{S} \left(\mathcal{S} \xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_2) \right), \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right) \\
 &= \inf_{\check{\vartheta}+\tilde{\varsigma}=\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_3+\check{\delta}_2+\check{\delta}_4} \mathcal{S} \left(\mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right), \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right) \right) \\
 &= \mathcal{S} \left(\inf_{\check{\vartheta}=\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_3} \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right), \inf_{\tilde{\varsigma}=\check{\delta}_2+\check{\delta}_4} \mathcal{S} \xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right) \\
 &= \mathcal{S} \left((\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta}), (\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\tilde{\varsigma}) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$(\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta} + \tilde{\varsigma}) \leq \mathcal{S} \left((\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta}), (\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\tilde{\varsigma}) \right).
 \tag{13}$$

$$(\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}) = \inf_{\check{\tau}\check{\vartheta}=\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_1+\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_2} \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_1), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_2) \right) \leq \inf_{\check{\vartheta}=\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_2} \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_2) \right) = (\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta}).
 \tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) ([\check{\vartheta}, \tilde{\varsigma}]) &= \inf_{[\check{\vartheta}, \tilde{\varsigma}]=[\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2]+[\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]} \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2]), \xi_{\tilde{D}}([\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]) \right) \\
 &\leq \inf_{[\check{\vartheta}, \tilde{\varsigma}]=[\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2]+[\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]} \mathcal{S} \left(\mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_2) \right), \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right) \right) \\
 &= \inf_{[\check{\vartheta}, \tilde{\varsigma}]=[\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_2+\check{\delta}_4]} \mathcal{S} \left(\mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right), \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right) \right) \\
 &= \mathcal{S} \left(\inf_{\check{\vartheta}=\check{\delta}_1+\check{\delta}_3} \mathcal{S} \left(\xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right), \inf_{\tilde{\varsigma}=\check{\delta}_2+\check{\delta}_4} \mathcal{S} \xi_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \xi_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right) \\
 &= \mathcal{S} \left((\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\vartheta}), (\xi_{\tilde{Q}} + \xi_{\tilde{D}}) (\tilde{\varsigma}) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\left(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}}\right) ([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) \leq \mathcal{S} \left(\left(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}}\right) (\check{\varrho}), \left(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{D}}\right) (\check{\varsigma}) \right).$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) &= \text{Max}_{\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma} = \check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_2 + \check{\delta}_3 + \check{\delta}_4} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_2), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3 + \check{\delta}_4) \right\} \\ &\leq \text{Max}_{\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma} = \check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_2 + \check{\delta}_3 + \check{\delta}_4} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max}_{\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma} = \check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_3 + \check{\delta}_2 + \check{\delta}_4} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Min}_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_3} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right\}, \text{Max}_{\check{\varsigma} = \check{\delta}_2 + \check{\delta}_4} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varrho}), (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varsigma}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varrho}), (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varsigma}) \right\}. \quad (15) \\ (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\tau}\check{\varrho}) &= \text{Max}_{\check{\tau}\check{\varrho} = \check{\tau}\check{\delta}_1 + \check{\tau}\check{\delta}_2} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_1), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\tau}\check{\delta}_2) \right\} \\ &\leq \text{Max}_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_2} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_2) \right\} \\ &= (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varrho}). \end{aligned}$$

(16)

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) ([\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}]) &= \text{Max}_{[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}] = [\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2] + [\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}([\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2]), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}([\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]) \right\} \\ &\leq \text{Max}_{[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}] = [\check{\delta}_1, \check{\delta}_2] + [\check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_4]} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max}_{[\check{\varrho}, \check{\varsigma}] = [\check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_3, \check{\delta}_2 + \check{\delta}_4]} \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right\}, \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \text{Max}_{\check{\varrho} = \check{\delta}_1 + \check{\delta}_3} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{Q}), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_3) \right\}, \text{Max}_{\check{\varsigma} = \check{\delta}_2 + \check{\delta}_4} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}(\check{\delta}_2), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}(\check{\delta}_4) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varrho}), (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varsigma}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varrho} + \check{\varsigma}) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varrho}), (\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}} + \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}) (\check{\varsigma}) \right\}.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{Q} + \tilde{D} \in \text{CIFNLS}(L)$. □

As with Proposition 3.5, the proof of the next result is straightforward.

Proposition 3.6 *Let $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{CIFNI}(L)$ and $\tilde{D} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{D}}) \in \text{CIFNI}(L)$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}$, $\check{G}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\tilde{D}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}$, $\check{G}_{\tilde{D}} = \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}}$ be complex fuzzy sets on L . Then $\tilde{Q} + \tilde{D} \in \text{CIFNI}(L)$.*

Definition 3.5 *Let L_1, L_2 be Lie subalgebras and $\aleph : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ be a homomorphism of Lie subalgebras. Let $\tilde{Q} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{Q}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L_1)$ and $\tilde{D} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}, \check{G}_{\tilde{D}}) \in \text{NIFS}(L_2)$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}}$, $\check{G}_{\tilde{Q}} = \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}}$ be complex fuzzy sets on L_1 and $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}} = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}$, $\Upsilon_{\tilde{D}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}}$, $\check{G}_{\tilde{D}} = \hat{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}}$ be complex fuzzy sets on L_2 . Define*

$$\begin{aligned} \aleph(\tilde{Q}) &= (\aleph(\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{Q}}), \aleph(\Upsilon_{\tilde{Q}}), \aleph(\check{G}_{\tilde{Q}})) = \left(\aleph \left(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}} \right), \aleph \left(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}}} \right), \aleph \left(\hat{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} e^{i\hat{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}}} \right) \right) \\ &= \left(\aleph \left(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} \right) e^{i\aleph(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}})}, \aleph \left(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{Q}} \right) e^{i\aleph(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{Q}})}, \aleph \left(\hat{\xi}_{\tilde{Q}} \right) e^{i\aleph(\hat{\chi}_{\tilde{Q}})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \aleph^{-1}(\check{\delta}_2) &= (\aleph^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{D}}), \aleph^{-1}(\Upsilon_{\tilde{D}}), \aleph^{-1}(\check{G}_{\tilde{D}})) \\ &= \left(\aleph^{-1} \left(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}} \right), \aleph^{-1} \left(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}}} \right), \aleph^{-1} \left(\hat{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} e^{i\hat{\chi}_{\tilde{D}}} \right) \right) \\ &= \left(\aleph^{-1} \left(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} \right) e^{i\aleph^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}})}, \aleph^{-1} \left(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{D}} \right) e^{i\aleph^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{D}})}, \aleph^{-1} \left(\hat{\xi}_{\tilde{D}} \right) e^{i\aleph^{-1}(\hat{\chi}_{\tilde{D}})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now for all $h \in L_2$ and $g \in L_1$ define

$\aleph(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) : L_2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$\aleph(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(h) = \sup \{ \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(g) \mid g \in L_1, \aleph(g) = h \}$$

$\aleph(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) : L_2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$\aleph(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(h) = \inf \{ \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(g) \mid g \in L_1, \aleph(g) = h \}$$

$\aleph(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) : L_2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$\aleph(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(h) = \inf \{ \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(g) \mid g \in L_1, \aleph(g) = h \}$$

$\aleph(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) : L_2 \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ as

$$\aleph(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(h) = \sup \{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(g) \mid g \in L_1, \aleph(g) = h \}$$

$\aleph(\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) : L_2 \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ as

$$\aleph(\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(h) = \inf \{ \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(g) \mid g \in L_1, \aleph(g) = h \}$$

$\aleph(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) : L_2 \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ as

$$\aleph(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(h) = \inf \{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(g) \mid g \in L_1, \aleph(g) = h \}$$

$\aleph^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}) : L_1 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$\aleph^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(g) = \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\aleph(g))$$

$\aleph^{-1}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}) : L_1 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$\aleph^{-1}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(g) = \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\aleph(g))$$

$\aleph^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}) : L_1 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$\aleph^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(g) = \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\aleph(g))$$

$\aleph^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}) : L_1 \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ as

$$\aleph^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(g) = \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\aleph(g))$$

$\aleph^{-1}(\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}) : L_1 \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ as

$$\aleph^{-1}(\dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(g) = \dot{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\aleph(g))$$

$\aleph^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}) : L_1 \rightarrow [0, 2\pi]$ as

$$\aleph^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(g) = \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\aleph(g)).$$

Proposition 3.7 Let $\mathcal{U} : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ be an epimorphism of Lie algebras and $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) \in \text{CNIFS}(L_1)$. Then $\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \in \text{CNIFS}(L_2)$.

Proof: Let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \in L_2$ and $\ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 = \mathcal{U}(\ell^*)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 = \mathcal{U}(\ell^{**})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right) &= \sup \left\{ \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) \mid \ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1, \mathcal{U}(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \right\} \\ &\geq \sup \left\{ \mathcal{T}^*\left(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^*), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^{**})\right) \mid \ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1, \mathcal{U}(\ell^*) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1, \mathcal{U}(\ell^{**}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{T}^*\left(\sup \left\{ \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^*) \mid \ell^* \in L, \mathcal{U}(\ell^*) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 \right\}, \sup \left\{ \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^{**}) \mid \ell^{**} \in L_1, \mathcal{U}(\ell^{**}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \right\}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{T}^*\left(\mathcal{U}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1\right), \mathcal{U}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

So,

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right) \geq \mathcal{T}^*\left(\mathcal{U}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1\right), \mathcal{U}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right)\right). \tag{2}$$

(11)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right) &= \inf \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) \mid \ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \right\} \\
&\leq \inf \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^*), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^{**}) \right\} \mid \ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1, \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \inf \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^*) \mid \ell^* \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 \right\}, \inf \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^{**}) \mid \ell^{**} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \right\} \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1\right), \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1\right), \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right) \right\}.$$

(12)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left([\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2]\right) &= \inf \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) \mid \ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) = [\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2] \right\} \\
&\leq \inf \left\{ \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^*), \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^{**}) \right\} \mid \ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1, ([\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})]) = [\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2] \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \inf \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^*) \mid \ell^* \in L, \mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 \right\}, \inf \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\ell^{**}) \mid \ell^{**} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \right\} \right\} \\
&= \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1\right), \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left([\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2]\right) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1\right), \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2\right) \right\}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 \in L_2$ and $\ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1 = \mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_2 = \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{U}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\right) &= \sup \left\{ \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
&\geq \sup \left\{ \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}\tilde{\ell} \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
&= \mathfrak{U}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{U}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\right) &= \sup \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
&\geq \sup \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}\tilde{\ell} \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
&= \mathfrak{U}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\right) &= \inf \left\{ \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
&\leq \inf \left\{ \tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}\tilde{\ell} \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
&= \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{U}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\right) &= \inf \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
&\leq \inf \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\ell}) \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
&= \mathfrak{U}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})\left(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}) &= \inf \left\{ \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\tau}\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
 &\leq \inf \left\{ \dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\ell}) \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
 &= \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\xi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(\tilde{\mathcal{O}})
 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

(17)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}) &= \inf \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\tau}\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
 &\leq \inf \left\{ \dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}\tilde{\ell} \mid \tilde{\ell} \in L_1, \mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \right\} \\
 &= \mathfrak{U}(\dot{\chi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}})(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, following the arguments presented in (1)–(17), it follows that $\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}) \in CIFN(L_2)$. \square

Its validity can be seen without difficulty.

Proposition 3.8 *Suppose $\mathfrak{U} : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ is a surjective Lie algebra homomorphism and $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) \in CNIFI(L_1)$. Then the image $\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$ belongs to $CIFNI(L_2)$.*

Proposition 3.9 *Suppose $\mathfrak{U} : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ is a surjective Lie algebra homomorphism and $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) \in CNIFS(L_1)$. Then the image $\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$ belongs to $CNIFS(L_2)$.*

Proof: Let $\ell^*, \ell^{**} \in L_1$. Then

(1)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &= \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^* + \ell^{**})) \\
 &= \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\
 &= \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\
 &\geq \mathcal{T}^*(r_B(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**}))) \\
 &= \mathcal{T}^*(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^{**})).
 \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^{**})).$$

(2)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) &= \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}([\ell^*, \ell^{**}])) \\
 &= \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}([\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})]) \\
 &\geq \mathcal{T}^*(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**}))) \\
 &= \mathcal{T}^*(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^{**})).
 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) \geq \mathcal{T}^*(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^{**})).$$

(3)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &= \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^* + \ell^{**})) \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\
 &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \right\} \\
 &= \text{Min} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})(\ell^{**}) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^{**}) \right\}. \\
 (4) \quad \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) ([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) &= \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}([\ell^*, \ell^{**}])) \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} ([\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})]) \\
 &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \right\} \\
 &= \text{Min} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^{**}) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) ([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) &\geq \text{Min} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^{**}) \right\}. \\
 (5) \quad \mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &= \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^* + \ell^{**})) \\
 &= \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\
 &= \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\
 &\leq \mathcal{S} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**}))) \\
 &= \mathcal{S} (\mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^{**})).
 \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &\leq \mathcal{S} (\mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^{**})). \\
 (6) \quad \mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) ([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) &= \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}([\ell^*, \ell^{**}])) \\
 &= \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} ([\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})]) \\
 &\leq \mathcal{S} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**}))) \\
 &= \mathcal{S} (\mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^{**})).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) ([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) \leq \mathcal{S} (\mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{D}}) (\ell^{**})). \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &= \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^* + \ell^{**})) \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\
 &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \right\} \\
 &= \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^{**}) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^{**}) \right\}. \\
 (8) \quad \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) ([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) &= \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}([\ell^*, \ell^{**}])) \\
 &= \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} ([\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})]) \\
 &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \right\} \\
 &= \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1} \left(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\ell^{**}) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\zeta_{\mathfrak{D}})([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\zeta_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\zeta_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right\}.$$

(9)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &= \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^* + \ell^{**})) \\ &= \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\ &= \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\ &\leq \mathcal{S} \left(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S} \left(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) \leq \mathcal{S} \left(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right).$$

(10)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) &= \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}([\ell^*, \ell^{**}])) \\ &= \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}([\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})]) \\ &\leq \mathcal{S} \left(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S} \left(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) \leq \mathcal{S} \left(\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right).$$

(11)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) &= \dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^* + \ell^{**})) \\ &= \dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\ &= \dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*) + \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \\ &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^* + \ell^{**}) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right\}.$$

(12)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) &= \dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}([\ell^*, \ell^{**}])) \\ &= \dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}}([\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})]) \\ &\leq \text{Max} \left\{ \dot{\xi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^*)), \dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\ell^{**})) \right\} \\ &= \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})([\ell^*, \ell^{**}]) \leq \text{Max} \left\{ \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^*), \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\ell^{**}) \right\}.$$

Let $\tilde{\ell} \in L$ and $\check{\tau} \in F$. Thus

(13)

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\check{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \hat{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\check{\tau}\tilde{\ell})) = \hat{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\check{\tau}\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell})) \geq \hat{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell})) = \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\tilde{\ell})$$

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\check{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \hat{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\check{\tau}\tilde{\ell})) = \hat{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\check{\tau}\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell})) \geq \hat{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell})) = \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\tilde{\ell}) \quad (14)$$

$$\mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\check{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \tilde{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\check{\tau}\tilde{\ell})) = \tilde{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\check{\tau}\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell})) \leq \tilde{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}}(\mathfrak{U}(\tilde{\ell})) = \mathfrak{U}^{-1}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathfrak{D}})(\tilde{\ell}). \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{U}^{-1} \left(\dot{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \dot{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell})) = \dot{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{\tau}\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\ell})) \leq \dot{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\ell})) = \mathcal{U}^{-1} \left(\dot{\zeta}_{\mathcal{D}} \right) (\tilde{\ell}). \quad (16)$$

$$\mathcal{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{D}})(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell})) = \dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{\tau}\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\ell})) \leq \dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\ell})) = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(\dot{\xi}_{\mathcal{D}})(\tilde{\ell}). \quad (17)$$

$$\mathcal{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{D}})(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell}) = \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\ell})) = \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{\tau}\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\ell})) \leq \dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\ell})) = \mathcal{U}^{-1}(\dot{\chi}_{\mathcal{D}})(\tilde{\ell}). \quad (18)$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{U}^{-1}(\check{\mathfrak{d}}_2) \in CIFN(L_1)$. □

The result below is straightforward to establish.

Proposition 3.10 *Suppose $\mathcal{U} : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ is a surjective Lie algebra homomorphism and $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \Upsilon_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}}) \in \text{CNIFS}(L_1)$. Then the image $\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}})$ belongs to $\text{CNIFS}(L_2)$.*

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced and explored the notions of complex intuitionistic fuzzy neutrosophic Lie subalgebras and Lie ideals, defined with respect to neutrosophic t-norms and s-norms. These structures serve as a natural extension of classical Lie subalgebras by incorporating complex-valued membership, non-membership, and indeterminacy components. We examined their fundamental properties and established how they interact under standard operations such as intersection, sum, and homomorphism. The results provide a deeper algebraic foundation for handling uncertainty, indeterminacy, and partial truth in Lie algebraic contexts. These developing frameworks demonstrate potential for application in mathematical modeling, theoretical physics, and information sciences, especially in environments where uncertainty displays intricate behavior. Additional studies may focus on a more detailed structural examination of these ideas and explore their practical significance in decision-making processes and various applied domains.

5. Future Work Problem

This paper establishes the basic definitions and characteristics of complex intuitionistic fuzzy neutrosophic Lie subalgebras and ideals concerning neutrosophic norms (t-norm T and s-norm S), while future research may seek to investigate applications and extensions of these structures within wider algebraic frameworks. Examine the expansion of complex intuitionistic fuzzy neutrosophic Lie subalgebras and ideals to graded Lie algebras, Lie superalgebras, and topological Lie algebras. Additionally, investigate how the proposed structures function with various neutrosophic aggregation operators apart from conventional t-norms and s-norms, and assess their significance in symmetry analysis and fuzzy control systems.

References

1. M. T. Abu Osman, On some products of fuzzy subgroups, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 24, pp. 79–86, (1987).
2. A. Alkouri and A. R. Salleh, Complex Atanassov's intuitionistic fuzzy sets, *International Conference on Fundamental and Applied Sciences, AIP Conference Proceedings*, vol. 1482, pp. 464–470, (2012).
3. K. T. Atanassov, Intuitionistic fuzzy sets, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 87–96, (1986).
4. K. T. Atanassov, New operations defined over the intuitionistic fuzzy sets, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 61, pp. 137–142, (1994).
5. K. T. Atanassov, *Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets Theory and Applications*, Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg, (1999).
6. J. J. Buckley and E. Eslami, *An Introduction to Fuzzy Logic and Fuzzy Sets*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg GmbH, (2002).
7. T. Hungerford, *Algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, (2003).
8. K. C. Kim and D. S. Lee, Fuzzy Lie ideals and fuzzy Lie subalgebras, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 94, pp. 101–107, (1998).
9. D. S. Malik and J. N. Mordeson, *Fuzzy Commutative Algebra*, World Science Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., (1995).
10. D. Ramot, M. Friedman, G. Langholz, and A. Kandel, Complex fuzzy logic, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 450–461, (2003).
11. D. Ramot, R. Milo, M. Friedman, and A. Kandel, Complex fuzzy sets, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 171–186, (2002).

12. R. Rasuli, Norms over intuitionistic fuzzy subgroups on direct product of groups, *Communications in Combinatorics, Cryptography & Computer Science*, vol. 1, pp. 39–54, (2023).
13. R. Rasuli, T-norms over complex fuzzy subgroups, *Mathematical Analysis and Its Contemporary Applications*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 33–49, (2023).
14. R. Rasuli, T-Fuzzy subalgebras of BCI-algebras, *International Journal of Open Problems in Computer Science and Mathematics*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 55–72, (2023).
15. R. Rasuli, Norms over Q-intuitionistic fuzzy subgroups of a group, *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 30–45, (2023).
16. R. Rasuli, Fuzzy ideals of BCI-algebras with respect to t-norm, *Mathematical Analysis and Its Contemporary Applications*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 39–50, (2023).
17. R. Rasuli, Intuitionistic fuzzy complex subgroups with respect to norms (T and S), *Journal of Fuzzy Extension and Applications*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 92–114, (2023).
18. R. Rasuli, Normalization, commutativity and centralization of TFSM(G), *Journal of Discrete Mathematical Sciences & Cryptography*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1027–1050, (2023).
19. R. Rasuli, Complex fuzzy Lie subalgebras and complex fuzzy ideals under t-norms, *Journal of Fuzzy Extension and Applications*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 173–187, (2023).
20. R. Rasuli, Anti fuzzy B-subalgebras under S-norms, *Communications in Combinatorics, Cryptography & Computer Science*, vol. 1, pp. 61–74, (2023).
21. R. Rasuli, Normality and translation of IFS($G \times Q$) under norms, *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 114–132, (2023).
22. R. Rasuli, Anti fuzzy multigroups and t-conorms, *Proc. of 2nd Nat. Conf. on Soft Computing and Cognitive Science*, Conbad Kavous Univ., Minudasht, Iran, April 18–19, (2023).
23. R. Rasuli, Anti fuzzy d-algebras and t-conorms, *Proc. of 2nd Nat. Conf. on Soft Computing and Cognitive Science*, Conbad Kavous Univ., Minudasht, Iran, April 18–19, (2023).
24. R. Rasuli, Some properties of fuzzy algebraic structures of QIFSN(G), *Proc. of 4th Int. Conf. on Computational Algebra, Computational Number Theory and Applications (CACNA'2023)*, Univ. of Kashan, Iran, July 4–6, (2023).
25. S. E. Yehia, Fuzzy ideals and fuzzy subalgebras of Lie algebras, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 80, pp. 237–244, (1996).
26. S. E. Yehia, The adjoint representation of fuzzy Lie algebras, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 119, pp. 409–417, (2001).
27. L. A. Zadeh, Fuzzy sets, *Information and Control*, vol. 8(3), pp. 338–353, (1965).
28. F. Smarandache, *Introduction to Neutrosophic Statistics*, Sitech & Education Publishing, USA, pp. 31–55, (2014).
29. F. Smarandache, *Introduction to neutrosophic measure, neutrosophic integral, and neutrosophic probability*, Sitech - Education; 2013 Nov 27.
30. H. Kamaci, Neutrosophic cubic Hamacher aggregation operators and their applications in decision making, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 234–255, (2020).
31. A. Salama, A. Sharaf Al-Din, I. Abu Al-Qasim, R. Alhabib, and M. Badran, Introduction to decision making for neutrosophic environment study on the Suez Canal Port, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 22–44, (2020).
32. J. Anuradha, Neutrosophic fuzzy hierarchical clustering for dengue analysis in Sri Lanka, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 31, pp. 179–199, (2020).
33. R. Sahin, Neutrosophic hierarchical clustering algorithms, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 19–24, (2014).
34. G. Shahzadi, M. Akram, and A. B. Saeid, An application of single-valued neutrosophic sets in medical diagnosis, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 80–88, (2017).
35. O. A. Ejaita and P. Asagba, An improved framework for diagnosing confusable diseases using neutrosophic-based neural network, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 16, pp. 28–34, (2017).
36. A. Chakraborty, B. Banik, S. P. Mondal, and S. Alam, Arithmetic and geometric operators of pentagonal neutrosophic number and its application in mobile communication service-based MCGDM problem, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 32, pp. 61–79, (2020).
37. M. Sahin, N. Olgun, V. Uluçay, A. Kargin, and F. Smarandache, A new similarity measure based on falsity value between single-valued neutrosophic sets based on the centroid points of transformed single-valued neutrosophic numbers with applications to pattern recognition, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 15, pp. 31–48, (2017).
38. M. M. Lotfy, S. ELhafeez, M. Eisa, and A. Salama, A review of recommender systems algorithms utilized in social networks-based E-learning systems& neutrosophic system, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 8, pp. 32–41, (2015).
39. F. Yuhua, Neutrosophic examples in physics, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 1, pp. 26–33, (2013).
40. P. Tharaniya, M. Raji, R. Rajalakshmi, S. Pramanik, R. Balapriya, and M. G. Lakshmi, Integrating traditional diagnostics methods through neutrosophic set based cancer analysis using machine learning techniques, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 93, pp. 1–21, (2025). doi: 10.5281/zenodo.16897803.

41. L. Guo, Extensions of fuzzy measures and their applications in data science, *Data-Driven Mathematics*, vol. 8, pp. 77–88, (2019).
42. M. Abobala and A. Hatip, An algebraic approach to neutrosophic Euclidean geometry, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 43, (2021).
43. R. P. Nihar, R. Rajalakshmi, S. Pramanik, M. Donganont, and P. K. Raut, Advancing breast cancer diagnosis: A comprehensive machine learning approach for predicting malignant and benign cases with precision and insight in a neutrosophic environment using neutrosophic numbers, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, vol. 87, pp. 763–784, (2025). doi: 10.5281/zenodo.15733455.
44. R. Rasuli, Complex intuitionistic fuzzy Lie subalgebras under norms, *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, Vol. 31, Number 1, 15-38, (2025).
45. A. Paul, S. Ghosh, P. Majumder, S. Pramanik, and F. Smarandache, Identification of influential parameters in soil liquefaction under seismic risk using a hybrid neutrosophic decision framework, *Journal of Applied Research on Industrial Engineering*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 144–175, (2025). doi: 10.22105/jarie.2024.486149.1699.

¹Mukhtar Ahmad ,
 Department of Mathematics,
 Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh 202002,
 India.
 0009-0006-4597-2278
 E-mail address: ¹mukhkh0786@gmail.com

and

²Surapati Pramanik,
 Nandalal Ghosh B.T. College,
 Panpur, Narayanpur, Dist- North 24 Parganas,
 India, PIN-743126.
 0000-0002-8167-7026
 E-mail address: ²surapati.math@gmail.com

and

³ Nazneen Khan,
 Department of Mathematics,
 College of Science Taibah University, Madina Munwara,
 Saudi Arabia.
 000-0003-3185-2815
 E-mail address: ³nk Khan@taibahu.edu.sa

and

*corresponding authors email: surapati.math@gmail.com